



an upgrade, on 10 January 2004, based on their determination that your discharge was proper as issued. The facts of your case remain substantially unchanged.

The Board carefully considered all potentially mitigating factors to determine whether the interests of justice warrant relief in your case in accordance with the Kurta, Hagel, and Wilkie Memos. These included, but were not limited to, your desire to upgrade your discharge character of service and change your reenlistment code to RE-1. The Board considered your contentions that: (1) your character of service should be upgraded because your substance abuse was to deal with your depression and anxiety during your service, (2) to deal with your anxiety and depression you would consume alcohol, (3) while in uniform, you conducted yourself in a professional manner, (4) the presumption of regularity does not apply to your case based on the evidence and supporting documentation you submitted, and (5) you made the decision to shorten your 4-year contract and take a BCD with the agreement of upgrading your discharge within a couple of years. For purposes of clemency and equity consideration, the Board considered the supporting documentation you provided in support of your application.

As part of the Board's review, a qualified mental health professional reviewed your contentions and the available records and provided the Board with an AO on 12 February 2024. The AO stated in pertinent part:

There is no evidence that he was diagnosed with a mental health condition in military service, or that he exhibited any psychological symptoms or behavioral changes indicative of a diagnosable mental health condition. Throughout his disciplinary processing, there were no concerns raised of a mental health condition that would have warranted a referral for evaluation. Post-service, he has provided evidence of mental health treatment that is temporally remote to military service and appears unrelated. Unfortunately, his personal statement is not sufficiently detailed to establish clinical symptoms in service or provide a nexus with his misconduct. Additional records (e.g., post-service mental health records describing the Petitioner's diagnosis, symptoms, and their specific link to his misconduct) may aid in rendering an alternate opinion.

The AO concluded, "it is my clinical opinion there is insufficient evidence of a mental health condition that may be attributed to military service. There is insufficient evidence to attribute his misconduct to a mental health condition."

After thorough review, the Board concluded your potentially mitigating factors were insufficient to warrant relief. Specifically, the Board determined your misconduct as evidenced by your NJPs and SPCM conviction, outweighed these mitigating factors. In making this finding, the Board considered the seriousness of your misconduct and concluded your misconduct showed a complete disregard for military authority and regulations. Further, the Board concurred with the AO and determined that there is insufficient evidence of a mental health condition that may be attributed to military service, and there is insufficient evidence to attribute your misconduct to a mental health condition. As the AO explained, your personal statement is not sufficiently detailed to establish clinical symptoms in service or provide a nexus with your misconduct. There is no evidence that you were diagnosed with a mental health condition in military service,

or that you exhibited any psychological symptoms or behavioral changes indicative of a diagnosable mental health condition. Therefore, the Board concluded that your discharge was proper and equitable under standards of law and discipline and that the discharge accurately reflects your conduct during your period of service, which was terminated by your BCD. Furthermore, the Board determined that the evidence of record did not demonstrate that you were not mentally responsible for your conduct or that you should otherwise not be held accountable for your actions. Finally, there is no provision in law or regulations that allows for recharacterization of a former service member's service due solely to the passage of time.

As a result, the Board concluded your conduct constituted a significant departure from that expected of a service member and continues to warrant a BCD. While the Board carefully considered the evidence you submitted in mitigation, even in light of the Kurta, Hagel, and Wilkie Memos and reviewing the record liberally and holistically, the Board did not find evidence of an error or injustice that warrants granting you the relief you requested or granting relief as a matter of clemency or equity. Ultimately, the Board concluded the mitigation evidence you provided was insufficient to outweigh the seriousness of your misconduct. Accordingly, given the totality of the circumstances, the Board determined your request does not merit relief.

You are entitled to have the Board reconsider its decision upon submission of new matters, which will require you to complete and submit a new DD Form 149. New matters are those not previously presented to or considered by the Board. In this regard, it is important to keep in mind that a presumption of regularity attaches to all official records. Consequently, when applying for a correction of an official naval record, the burden is on the applicant to demonstrate the existence of probable material error or injustice.

Sincerely,

4/19/2024

